(*e*) whether the Chief Engineer has received a deputation of the Work Establishment staff, and, if so, whether he has made any recommendations to the Government upon the representation made by the deputation;

(*f*) whether they are aware that the Work Establishment staff has been made permanent and pensionable in the sister State of Cochin; and

(*g*) whether they will be pleased to consider the question of making the Work Establishment staff a part of the permanent staff of the Public Works Department?

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Secretary to Government*):

(*a*) The answer is in the negative.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) No; they are only allowed to have 14 days' leave on full pay during a year.

(*e*) Yes; but the Chief Engineer has made no recommendations to the Government.

(*f*) The answer is in the negative.

(*g*) The answer is in the negative.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil* cum *Devicolam*): Sir, I wish to have a ruling regarding disallowance of interpellations. Under Rule 8, has the President got any power to disallow questions or to amend or return the questions to members?

PRESIDENT: I shall consider the matter and give a ruling at the next session.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Sir, some questions were asked by me in Karkatakam last, *i. e.*, in 1100, and I was made to repeat those questions three or four times and till now they have not been answered. To-morrow is the only day left and if the Government are not prepared to answer those questions, there is no use of making us again and again repeat the questions.

PRESIDENT: I suggest to the member to write to the Secretary to the Legislative Council about that.

We will now proceed with the discussion on Motion 313.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—(*contd.*)

DEMAND XV—AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES—(*contd.*)

***Motion 313*—(*contd.*)**

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Karthikapalli*): I beg to support the motion brought forward by Mr. C. P. Tarakan with a view to the abolition of the monopoly on lime-shells. In this connection, I should like to bring to the notice of the Government and this House certain facts which have come to my knowledge. I visited Kumarakam which is the main seat of the lime-shell industry, just after the first

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. G. Raman Menon.]

auctions took place. I found from reliable local enquiry made by me that the price of lime-shells had at that place become double of what it was before. So, there s no question that this monopoly has affected the price of lime-shells to a very great degree, to a degree that is not justified in any way by the income to the Government from that head. During the last Budget Session, the contractor's party as well as the people's party came here and represented matters to many of the members here and I understood from both the parties that the contractor had during that particular year, that is 1100, collected a very large quantity of lime-shells which could not be disposed of during that particular year. So he had in hand a large quantity of lime-shells and his plea was that unless the monopoly or auction is continued for another year at least he would be a very great loser. That shows that no sort of conservation of the quantity of lime-shells was effectively resorted to by the department, because the contractor was allowed to remove a very large quantity, as much as he could remove, in that particular year and that was the thing which made it necessary to continue the monopoly for another year. So, what I submit is that the plea of the necessity for the conservation of the lime-shells has not been practically given effect to by the department.

Another thing that I wish to point out is that if conservation is the object of the department, there is no use of giving a monopoly to the contractor. Just as in the case of the fish industry, to the actual workers licenses may be given. Of course, if the Government want to conserve the amount of lime-shells available, to a certain extent they can limit the number of licenses every year. That legitimate object can be compassed without the present system of monopolies. Monopolies are objectionable. Of course, it gives an opportunity for gain to the middlemen, but not to the actual workers or to the Government. So, as far as possible, that should be avoided.

Another point which I wish to urge is that the Government should not try to make a profit out of these lakes. The lakes, the sea, etc., I think, come under *res communes* in law. The Government have no particular property right in the sea or the lakes. But it is in the interests of the public that the Government should exercise some control. That is all. The object should not be to make any profit out of it. With these words, I support the motion brought forward by Mr. C. P. Tarakan.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Sir, in connection with this discussion upon the lime-shells, certain relevant facts will have to be kept steadily in view. These lime-shells are produced in a section of the Vembanad lake which is admittedly property belonging to the Government. With respect to the lime-shells, it cannot be said that they are *res nullius* in spite of the proposition of law enunciated by my esteemed friend Mr. Raman Menon. I have to observe that the lime-shells are property belonging to the Government. It may be that the neighbouring owners of property by a long course of user have established a right to appropriate a portion of these lime-shells under any law of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

prescription that may be in force in Travancore. That is a question which will have to be separately investigated. *Prima facie*, therefore, I am submitting that the lime-shells are the property of the Government. The question now is whether the Government should take care to utilise such property of the Government in the best way they deem fit for the use of the general public. My submission is, legally speaking, it is difficult to oppose the claim of the Government to regulate the use of such property as they have got under their control unless it be that some private individual is able to prove a competing claim with respect to the lime-shells in question. Such being the case, I cannot reasonably take any objection to the Government proceeding to safeguard their interests in the property that may be found at the bottom of the Vembanad lake beyond the imaginary line to be drawn from the Ariyad light-house to the south-western point of Kumarakom. I think that was the line that the Director of Agriculture mentioned, as dividing the lime-shell monopoly region from the non-monopoly region.

Then the question has been raised from another standpoint, whether it does not hit hard the persons who stand to gain by a promiscuous and indiscriminate method of collection of these lime-shells. Some gentlemen living about this particular lime-shell region hope that they would be better off or would be obliged to pay less for the lime-shells if provided by persons who make a living by diving in this particular region to collect the shells. Under the Government control, they complain that they are put to great loss in the matter of purchasing these lime-shells. That is a point worthy of consideration. I heard the Director of Agriculture stoutly opposing that aspect of the question. But in my view of the matter, Sir, in spite of the vehement argument that the Director of Agriculture finds it possible to urge against my friend Mr. Kunjitomman, the possibility that the price of lime would stand higher in the present circumstances is more or less clearly established. It may not be due entirely to the control now thought to be exercised by Dr. Kunjan Pillai's department. Far from it. There are a number of adventitious circustances created by the establishment of tolls and by the enactment of the Canals and Ferries Regulation, all of which seek to impose further taxation upon the ordinary subject and especially the vehicles that carry these lime-shells.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): May I know from Mr. Narayana Pillai whether he is buying lime for the construction of his house and what price he is paying for it at Trivandrum?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I am purchasing lime, and on a comparison of the price for which I am purchasing lime here in Trivandrum with the price at which the Kumarakom contractor's man offered to sell lime to me, I find that after all there is hardly much difference between the two.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): May I know at what price he is purchasing lime in Trivandrum?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I cannot exactly quote the price. I entrusted the matter to an agent of mine. But I enquired as to the possibility of getting cheaper lime from Kumarakom and I found that at the rate now published by the Kumarakom contractor there will not be much difference in purchasing the lime collected in some of the nearer lakes, say Parur or Ashtamudi lake or some other lake near about there. That is my experience. Sir, that particular point is one on which I would certainly side with my friend Mr. Kunjitomman in requesting the Government that so far as the consumption of lime is regulated by the control exercised by the Government, it should not be made prohibitive for the ordinary citizen to purchase lime for his use. That is the only point I think that may reasonably be considered in this connection and if the Government would be good enough to consider that particular aspect of the proposition, I think that would be sufficient to remove the grievances experienced by the people in this matter.

I recollect that on a prior occasion some of us proceeded as a small deputation to you, Sir, as the Dewan of the State, in the tiffin room adjoining this Hall when you assured us that the matter would receive consideration at the hands of the Government. If that consideration is maturing, this aspect of the matter may also be taken along with it in solving the problem.

MR. K. K. THOMAS (*Kottayam*): May I know from the member whether he is in favour of the suggestion made by Mr. Raman Menon regarding the issue of licenses for the collection of lime-shells?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PLLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I have no objection in adopting that course. But how that will affect the price will depend upon the terms of the license itself.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): May I know from the member whether it will not be better to encourage competition by giving it to several licensees than to allow it to be concentrated in the hands of a single licensee?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): If there is a single licensee and he is given the license under certain terms, it will depend upon those terms. If we leave it to unwholesome competition on the part of a number of licensees who probably would try to outwit each other, that again would depend upon the nature of the licenses and the conditions under which those licenses are given.

PRESIDENT: The time-limit for this demand will expire after 45 minutes. But if the members here wish the time to be extended, I am prepared to do so.

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kuinatnad*): സർ, ഇതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് എല്ലാസാമാജികന്മാരും ധാരാളമായിട്ട് പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതു കൊണ്ടും

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

സമയം അതിക്രച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടും ഞാൻ ക്കൂടുതലായി ഒന്നും തന്നെ പറയണമെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. എന്റെ മോഷൻ വോട്ടിനിടണമെന്നു ഞാൻ അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

PRESIDENT: Do you press it to the vote of the House?

MR. C. P. TARAKAN (*Kunnatnad*): Yes, Sir.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): Sir, I have already stated what I had to say on this question. I do not wish to take any more of the time of the House. If the House really wants to press the matter, it may do so. The Government will remain neutral as they are willing to act according to the decision of the non-official members. As I said yesterday, it may be necessary to exercise some sort of control over the collection of lime-shells and in what way it should be done it has not been settled. The Government leave the question of the lease entirely to the decision of the non-official members of this House.

The motion was put to the vote of the House and declared carried, 14 voting *for* and 11 *agai st.*

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I demand a poll.

A poll was taken with the following result:—

AYES—14.

1.	Mr. Paul Daniel	8.	Mr. N. Kumaran
2.	,, P. Habeed Mahomed	9.	,, Tariatu Kunjitomman
3.	,, A. J. John	10.	,, K. C. Mammen Mappillai
4.	,, K. I. Joseph	11.	,, R. Padmanabhan
5.	,, N. V. Joseph	12.	,, G. Raman Menon
6.	,, X. G. Lopez	13.	,, C. P. Tarakan
7.	,, C. Kerala Varma Koil Tampuran	14.	,, C. P. Thomas

NOES—12.

1.	Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai	7.	Mr. K. P. Nilakanta Pillai
2.	,, T. Kumara Pillai	8.	,, M. N. Pilai
3.	,, K. Madhavan Pillai	9.	,, G. Paramesvaran Pillai
4.	,, G. Narayana Pillai	10.	,, Changanachery K. Paramesvaran Pillai
5.	,, Kallur Narayana Pillai	11.	,, K. K. Thomas
6.	,, P. K. Narayana Pillai	12.	,, C. N. Tuppan Namputiri

NEUTRALS 17.

1.	Mr. I. C. Chacko	10.	Mrs. M. Poonen Lukose
2.	,, R. Dhanukoti Pillai	11.	Mr. T. P. Ramasubba Aiyar
3.	,, K. George	12.	Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar
4.	,, R. K. Krishna Pillai	13.	Mr. S. C. H. Robinson
5.	,, R. Krishnaswami Aiyar	14.	,, K. Sivarama Panikkar
6.	Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai	15.	,, V. Subba Aiyar
7.	Mr. K. V. Natesa Aiyar	16.	,, V. S. Subrahmanya Aiyar
8.	,, R. Nilakanta Pillai	17.	,, A. J. Van Ross
9.	,, Kayyalam Paramesvaran Pillai		

The motion was carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Motions 314 to 318.

The following motions lapsed, the time allotted for the demand having expired:—

MR. C. P. THOMAS:

314. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 1·74 lakhs under Demand XV by Re. 1

MR. T. J. MATTHEW:

315. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 1·74 lakhs under Demand XV by Re. 1.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON:

316. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 1·74 lakhs under Demand XV by Rs. 10.

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI:

317. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 1·74 lakhs under Demand XV by Rs. 10.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH:

318. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 1·74 lakhs under Demand XV by Rs. 100.

The question that the sum of Rs. 1·74 lakhs less Re. 1 under Demand XV—Agriculture and Fisheries—be granted was then put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XVI—INDUSTRIES—Rs. 1·12 LAKHS.

MR. I. C. CHACKO (*Director of Industries*): Sir, I rise to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1·12 lakhs under Demand XVI—Industries.

22 A. INDUSTRIES—DIRECTION.

Motions 319 to 324.

The following motion was deemed not to have been moved as the member was absent.

MR. T. J. MATTHEW:

319. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,196 for Direction by Re. 1.

The following motions were not moved:—

MR. K. I. JOSEPH:

320. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,196 for Direction by Rs. 100.

22 B. INDUSTRIES—INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI:

321. To omit the allotment of Rs. 550 for pay of the temporary additional teachers.

The following motion was deemed not to have been made as the member was absent:—

MR. A. K. PILLAI:

322. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 550 for Spinning Instructor by Rs. 10.

The following motions were not moved:—

MR. K. I. JOSEPH:

323. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 63,713 for Industrial Education by Rs. 100.

22 C. INDUSTRIES—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH:

324. o reduce the allotment of R 22,151 for Industrial Development by Rs. 100.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly